

From: Edward Hejtmanek
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/28/02 10:46am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

to whom it may concern,

I am in the eighth grade and have been assigned to learn all that I can about the Microsoft cases, the current one and the one that started in the 1990's. I typically sympathize with big companies and I am an avid user of Internet Explorer. I believe that if the states want to settle out of court, as they did in the first case, then that is a perfectly acceptable alternative and therefore the older case was settled fairly.

The new case of AOL-Time Warner and nine states versus Microsoft, is deserved on Microsoft's side. They used anti-competitive business practices to get over the Netscape Navigator. But the question is really is it a better system? If it is then it should have more of the browser market and deserves it. For example, I recently heard that AOL uses the Explorer as it's default for when you join. Why would they do that when they have their own browser, unless it is inferior to the Internet Explorer. So if it is a superior browser why are they taking them to court, they want Microsoft to not bundle the browser with the operating system? Fine, they won't need to if it is a better system they will have the same, or more of the market. As John D. Rockefeller incorrectly said "Combination [monopoly] is necessary."

Edward Hejtmanek